DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 480 SP 027 878

AUTHOR Sage, George H.
TITLE Social Science of Physical Education and Sport: Reflections and Future Directions. 1986 Alliance Scholar Lecture.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (Cincinnati, OH, April 10-13, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Athletics; *Educational Needs; Higher Education; *Physical Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Sport Psychology; *Teacher Education Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS *Sport Sociology

ABSTRACT

The form and content of preservice programs for physical education teachers are in the hands of those individuals who develop curricula. Courses in sports studies--such as the sociology of sports and sport psychology--need to be an integral part of such programs. Preservice preparation programs can be reorganized to contain this important element. The shortsightedness of curricula planning that does not make room for sport studies is a loss to all physical education professionals, especially to those students who are preparing for careers in teaching, coaching, exercise science, and leisure. While sport studies often have applications for helping human movement professionals with their specific day-to-day tasks, sport studies also have very good potential for applied, policy, and evaluation research that can help schools, teachers, coaches, and directors of fitness programs. A three-page reference list is provided. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272480

SOCIAL SCIENCE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT: REFLECTIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

1986 ALLIANCE SCHOLAR LECTURE

George H. Sage
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Sage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 11, 1986

SP027878

SOCIAL SCIENCE OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT: REFLECTIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

You may wonder how one is selected as the Alliance Scholar. The vision that many have is that the recipient's work is narrowly specialized and research is done on a very limited set of topics. I guess that is the view I once had, so I was quite surprised to be selected for this honor because my career has not followed that pathway at all.

Career patterns are often shaped by specific contexts of work, and mine is an example of this principle. Shortly after acquiring my doctorate from UCLA, I began work at the University of Northern Colorado. This was in the mid-1960's and a number of exciting events were taking place in physical education. The trend that became known as the subdiscipline movement was in its infancy. Undergraduate and graduate curricula were changing, and new specializations in motor learning, sport psychology, sport sociology, and sport history were formalizing. Each department was busy revising its programs and securing faculty to teach the new courses.

Our physical education faculty at UNC wanted to be on the forefront of the changes taking place. We took an inventory of our professional/scholarly strengths and concluded that we had excellent strengths in several areas of study but we had no one with in-depth training in the psychological aspects of human movement.

I was well-prepared in the social science of physical activity because at UCLA my specialization had been in what was called the social foundations of physical education and I had an undergraduate major in social science. But at that time our faculty decided that the sociology of sport was too new and undefined to offer courses, and what we needed badly was someone to initiate a motor learning/sport psychology area. In accord with the institutional priorities, I took post-doctoral study at CSU and

UNC in psychology -- everything from physiological psychology to cognitive psychology -- and then coordinated what we call our psychological kinesiology area. It was not until the early 1970's that we initiated courses in the sociology of sport. From then to the present, I have also coordinated our sport sociology program. Psychology and sociology of sport have grown enormously over the past 20 years, and I have tried to stay abreast of both through research and writing because I have a tremendous academic investment in both, but also because I find that each contributes to understanding theories and empirical issues in the other. Moreover, I have been somewhat ambivalent about the extreme fragmentation that has occurred with our new subdisciplines. I'm not sure that it has been a total blessing. I keep recalling the admonition of my favorite sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959) who once said: "Avoid the arbitrary specialization of prevailing academic [fashions]. . . .seek, continually and imaginatively, to draw upon the perspectives and materials, the ideas and methods, of any and all sensible studies of man and society" (p. 225).

My work has had a wide base in the behavioral and social science of human movement rather than narrow specialization. I am grateful to the Alliance Scholar Committee for recognizing alternative paths to this award.

Although I have conducted research and published in motor learning and sport psychology I have had more of a sustained interest in the sociological analysis of sport and I have had a particular interest in sport occupations -- especially the occupation of physical educator and the occupation of athletic coach. I would like to take a few minutes to review -- albeit in a brief and cursory way -- some of the research on coaches and physical educators I have been involved with over the past 15 years. One vignette before I do this. On several occasions I have heard researchers review their work and they frequently apologize for it, saying that looking back on it from the vantage of the present, the topics studied seem

unimportant, the methods used seem primative, and the conclusions drawn seem simplistic. I have some of the same feelings about my work, but I suppose one must understand the context of the time in which research is done. What seems unimportant, primative, and simplistic now was not so at the time. We have benefitted from the work that has preceeded and that is why we feel so superior to it now.

My earliest research on athletic coaches was a response tc the issues and controversies of the time. In the late 1960's and early 70's American high school and college athletic coaches came under vigorous attack by individuals from within and outside the field of education. These attacks centered on the alleged ruthless methods that athletic coaches use in carrying out the tasks of coaching their teams. Richard Christie and Florence Geis (1970) at Columbia University had developed a theory about manipulative behaviors which they called Machiavellianism and they had developed an instrument for measuring this characteristic which they called a Mach scale. They suggested that there is a relationship between Machiavellianism and membership in occupations; they suggested that high-Machs will more likely be found in occupations in which the situational conditions resemble the experimental conditons under which high-Machs are more successful. It seemed to me that if critics were correct in what they were saying about coaches, then high school and college coaches should certainly manifest high Machiavellianism, and, more importantly, there was a social structural basis for it because the occupational situational conditions of coaching seemed to be similar to those in which Christie and Geis found high Machiavellianism to be present (Sage, 1972a).

Data were obtained from a national sample of college and high school football and basketball coaches. The results of my study showed no differences between the Mach scores of a sample of male college students

and any of the college and high school athletic coaching groups. Moreover, there were no differences in Machiavellianism among college and high school coaches with regard to years of age or head coaching experience, and there were no differences in Machiavellianism between college and high school coaches with winning records and coaches with losing records. In a post hoc interpretation of the results, I tried to explain the differences in what I had hypothesized and the actual findings through a reanalysis of the social situational conditions of the coaching occupation.

According to a number of the critics of coaches during the period between 1965 and 1975, many of the problems in college and high school sports were attributable to the behavior of coaches and was related to the value orientation of coaches. They were said to be so conservative as to be almost aberrant. Their values were said to be so incongruous with those held by their athletes that this produced a great deal of frustration and conflict between coaches and athletes. So I turned to the study of coaches values Sage, 1972b). I investigated the political, social, educational, economic, and personal-moral values of college coaches. Coaches value profiles were first compared with college students, and, although conservatism was not extreme among coaches, I found it to be more pronounced than among college students. Next, coaches value profiles were compared with American businessmen. The coaches displayed greater liberal tendencies than businessmen.

Socialization theory suggests that members of a group tend to possess the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are normative for that group, and there is some research indicating that this is true of members of certain occupations. Research on values also indicates that adults tend to become more conservative in value orientation with age. I was curious about how all this was related to coaches (Sage, 1973). I assessed whether coaches in different sports were significantly different in value orientation and

whether coaches over 40 years of age were different from those under 40 years of age. No significant differences were found on any of the dimensions of value profiles when comparing coaches from the various sports. Furthermore, no significant differences were found on any of the items between coaches over 40 years of age and coaches under 40 years of age.

Now I want to turn to a set of studies that were concerned with the career contingencies of physical educators and coaches.

In terms of occupational status attainment, it is frequently asserted that America is the land of opportunity. A favorite slogan is that "anyone who can't make it doesn't deserve to." On the other hand, there are those who claim: "It's not what you know, but who you know." Sociologist Ralph Turner (1960) proposed two ideal-type patterns of social mobility which served as organizing concepts for formulating a theory of career mobility. They are the concepts of "contest" and "sponsored" mobility. Contest mobility occurs when someone is occupationally mobile through his or her own achievements. Sponsored mobility occurs when one is chosen or promoted by an established elite, or obtains a desired position because of "connections."

Early studies of academic mobility in higher education emphasized the role of sponsored mobility in the allocation of jobs. These studies found that university faculty whose doctoral degree was granted from one of the most prestigious departments tended to be employed in departments of high prestige, and that faculty whose doctoral origin was from a lower prestige level tended to be employed at universities with a lower level status.

John Massengale and I (1982) were interested in applying contest and sponsored mobility theory with college physical educators. We studied the relationship between the prestige of graduate physical education

departments where faculty obtained their doctorates and the prestige of physical education departments where faculty are now employed. The data from our study clearly showed that the graduate physical education department in which one receives the doctorate has a determining effect on where one is employed in college physical education. Prestige based on doctoral origin is a powerful predictor of a faculty member's likelihood of being employed in one of the top graduate departments.

While the connection between organizational prestige and career contingencies is documented with respect to the academic stratification system in American higher education, John Loy and I (1978) were interested in whether the relationship between organizational prestige and career mobility of professors also obtains in the case of another group of individuals in the university, namely college athletic coaches.

Data were obtained from a national sample of college head football and basketball coaches. Our findings showed a close relationship between organizational prestige and career mobility patterns of coaches and suggested that the interorganizational mobility patterns of collegiate athletic personnel are similar to those of collegiate academic personnel.

The finding of these studies clearly support the "sponsored" model of career mobility for physical education faculty and college football and basketball coaches rather that the "contest" model. Our findings suggest that graduate faculty in the field of physical education and college football and basketball coaches are bound to essentially the same career status attainment system that exists in a variety of academic disciplines in higher education. Such findings support the view that American higher education is rigidly stratified, and that academic credentials and organizational connections are the "success" criteria rather than individual achievement factors.

Turning to another set of studies, regional mobility has been a long

standing issue in higher education for a number of reasons, one of which is its impact on regional allocation of faculty in higher education thoughout the country and career mobility patterns within higher education. There has been a growing interest in the migration of faculty in higher education during the past two decades because georgaphical mobility plays an important role in professional stratification. This is primarily due to the significance of certain jobs in positioning people in that profession and for allocating social status and power. Geographical mobility studies are useful not only for understanding occupational mobility and recruitment but also for gaining insight into the development of disciplines. The topic of migration patterns among faculty in higher education has had as it fundamental concern the distribution of academic talent between the various regions of the country.

John Loy and I (1978) decided to study the geographical migration patterns of college football and basketball coaches. We found that, as a group, when migrating from hometown to college, from college to first position, and from first position to present position, the majority of coaches remain in the same NCAA district. Thus, the career geographical mobility tends to be limited. When migration occurs across NCAA district boundries, it tends to be between contiguous districts.

John Massengale and I (Sage & Massengale, 1985) analyzed the geographical mobility of college physical educators. Previous studies of geographical migration tendencies have noted that the most prominent pattern of geographical movement from doctoral degree to current employment is the inheritance of the doctoral degree region. Previous investigations have also found that regions which have the highest prestige institutions tend to export their graduates while other regions tend to experience a gain in graduates from the high prestige regions. Moreover, graduates of

high prestige institutions are the most interregionally mobile while the least mobile group have attended low prestige institutions. Finally, a relatively high incidence of departmental inbreeding among the most prestigious university departments has been a consistent finding.

The findings of our study suggested that graduate faculty in physical education are bound to essentially the same career geographical mobility patterns that exist in a variety of academic disciplines in higher education. Beyond this, the study is of more general importance because of the information it provides for understanding the social organization of graduate physical education departments

Now I would like to turn to a brief description of my current research on high school athletic coaches. Most previous research on teacher/coaches has studied teachers of physical education who were also coaches. Previous research has tended to use survey methods -- mostly questionnaires -- in the data collection. There has been a neglect of the actual on-the-job work of teacher/coaches -- and this led to my current research project.

I wanted to get into the schools and study teacher/coaches who taught in other academic areas, in addition to physical education. Furthermore, I wanted to study coaches up close. I was interested in more than just their attitudes, or their values, or their leadership characteristics. I was interested in studying the occupational culture of teacher/coaches, meaning I was interested in what it is really like being a coach and what they think about themselves and their situation.

I spent four months in several high schools in Colorado. I went to the school each day and observed teacher/coaches at work, meaning while they were teaching and while they were coaching. I observed coaches who taught physical education, math, social studies, industrial arts, English, foreign languages, etc. In addition, I conducted in-depth interviews with over 50 teacher/coaches. I have over 2,000 pages of field notes and

interview transcripts. This study is now in the data analysis stage.

I would like to use my remaining time to make some remarks about the future of the sport studies. Several preliminaries must be attended to before I proceed with the main points that I want to make. First, this is not another call to arms in the protracted discipline versus profession war. Too many misfired missiles already lay harmlessly on the battlefields of this dispute. My purpose is not to chastise anyone working in any of the human movement fields. The main theme of what I am going to say is really in the form of a modest appeal -- an appeal to those who control the curricula to rethink the role of sports studies in the preparation of professionals for physical education, exercise and sports sciences, and leisure studies. An assumption that is linked to this appeal is that sport studies are not given sufficient recognition at the present time in our programs.

Between 1965 and 1975 courses in sport sociology, sport history, sport philosophy, and anthropology of play began to appear regularly in university schedules -- in most cases under the aegis of departments of physical education. Simultaneously, national and international societies for each of these fields of study were created, and, in several cases, specialized journals began publication.

One might infer from what I have said that the growth in sports studies was accompanied -- even nurtured -- for their value in the training of human movement specialists. Not so. In fact, surveys of the status of sport studies in North America have found that the majority of our preservice programs do not require these courses (Southard, 1982). For example, of the 536 colleges and universities polled by Dan Southard, only 7 percent of the teacher preparation programs required sociology of sport. None of the sport studies was listed in the top 12 out of 20 competencies

teacher educators believed to be important for an aspiring physical educator. Earle Zeigler (1980) reported that the number of philosophy of sport and physical education courses has declined since 1960.

So there is no misunderstanding about my position toward the importance of the biosciences for future professionals in human movement, let me confirm my support for the movement biosciences. I have no quarrel with these disciplines. As for pedagogy, I declare my devotion to it as well. Certainly, aspiring physical educators must learn effective techniques -- must acquire "know how" -- for promoting motor skill learning. Moreover, I am deeply sympathetic to the observation made recently by Locke and Dodds (1984) that pedagogical preparation for the work of teaching physical education has been cheated by time constraints. Not nearly enough time is given over to the preparation of physical educators. Many trade occupations require more preservice education. So I am indeed "familiar with the tortured and elusive problems which beset the preparation of [physical education] teachers" (Locke and Siedentop 1980, p. 36).

Having made these genuflections, I want to emphasize that I do not think subject matter in the movement biosciences and pedagogical studies is adequate preparation for teaching physical education, coaching, sport management, exercise specialists, or any of the human movement specialities. As important as bioscience subject matter and techniques of teaching are, what will be missing -- tragically missing, in my view -- is the possession of a quality of mind which is essential to grasping the interplay of humans and society, of biology and history, of self and world. This particular perspective is what C. Wright Mills (1959) called "the sociological imagination." According to Mills:

> The sociological imagination enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and

the external career of . . .individuals. It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self -- and to see the relations between the two (p. 5,7).

While Mills used the word "sociological," he went to great pains to emphasize that his use of it did not mean merely the academic discipline of sociology; indeed, he meant it to apply to all of the social sciences and humanities.

As valuable and necessary as the biosciences and pedagogy are to the preservice preparation of our students, they do not address the connection between sport and exercise sciences and the broader society, especially as it is manifested in ideological, political, and economic systems. Both tend to completely ignore the sociocultural, historical, and political dimensions of sport as a cultural activity. They tend to be systematically a-historical and non-comparative. Training in the exercise biosciences emphasizes efficiency and performance in physical activities; the professional with a bioscience perspective will be primarily concerned with how to make people perform better. Training in pedagogy emphasizes efficient use of time and space and the organization of groups of various ages and sizes. The current buzz word in sport pedagogy is "academic learning time," that is, counting seconds students are actively practicing or performing the task to be learned. The emphasis, then, of a teacher employing pedagogical skills is on being a technician. The focus is on student acquisition of motor skills as a teacher's major goal (Graham and Heimerer, 1981).

In the biosciences faith in the natural science paradigm and abstract empiricism is unconstrained. And sport pedagogy appears to be adopting this approach as well. It has recently been claimed that in the past

decade a "development of descriptive measurement systems in the tradition of the natural sciences" has emerged in pedagogy, and that there is now a "natural science of teaching" which is concerned with teaching behavior that is correlated with student learning (Siedentop, 1982).

Now, do not misunderstand my remarks; they are not meant as criticisms of any of the exercise biosciences or sports pedagogy as disciplines. Indeed, as I have said before they both have essential contributions to make in the preparation of professionals. But they are not enough. They have little feeling or sensitivity to the constitutive character of sports as an element of culture, nor do they deal with the class character of sports. Indeed, they tend to implicity validate dominant attitudes about the social character of sport -- their approach is unreflecting and uncritical; they accept the dominant sport, exercise, fitness, and leisure forms and allocate resources accordingly.

What Can Sports Studies Contribute?

The first issue that must be confronted when attempting to stress the importance for sport studies learning experiences to our programs is the compulsive demand that sport studies convey <u>specific</u> applications of their subject matter to practitioners. I want to suggest that this expectation for sport studies is misguided. The role of sport studies is not to provide specific prescriptions for professionals. While exercise physiologists might discover a way of developing strength that may readily be translated into sports conditioning programs, biomechanicians may discover a better way to apply force in executing a sport skill, and teacher educators may find more effective methods for enhancing group learning -- clear examples of "application for the practitioner" -- the sport studies will not very often provide neat recipies for the practitioner (Sage, 1977), but that does not diminish their usefulness, for that is not primarily how they

should be judged.

Let's face it, physical educators, coaches, and professionals in other movement occupations are notoriously socially naive. Preservice programs have traditionally been heavy in subject matter emphasizing how to teach motor skills, how to develop strength and endurance, and how to use the levers of the body to produce force (whether they have been effective in these matters is another issue), but they have been sadly 'acking in making aspiring professionals aware of the social consequences of their programs and socially conscious of the changing nature of modern society and the complexities and contraditions of contemporary sport forms. Preservice programs of most aspiring human movement professionals never once encourage students to question their own personsal attitudes and values about sports and other leisure activities or to make them explicit.

One contribution that a social perspective toward physical activity can make is an expanded social awareness and an elevated social consciousness in relation to social order and change. One important outcome of such an approach is that the social world of sporting activities is viewed not as some given entity controlled by unalterable natural laws but as a social process capable of being transformed by human agents (Giddens, 1979).

In 20 years of teaching physical education majors, I have consistently found that there is little ideological sensitivity among them; indeed there tends to be a blissful unsophistication about the social relations which control education, physical education, and sport. To a frightening degree there is a naivete to the social context and material conditions underlying physical culture. Most professional programs do not once confront students with questions about the larger social issues and the consequences of modern sports forms. Instead, students are fed a diet of traditional

slogans, cliches, sacred cows, and ritualized trivia about sport. Sport and society are typically presented as discrete institutional arenas, with sport seen as a realm where strength and endurance is developed, character is built, and virtue pursued.

Alan Ingham (1985) has argued that "kinesiological and health science seems to have endorsed a kind of rationality that fragments and isolates -- a kind of rationality appropriate to technical problem-solving but not to developing holistic conceptions of social life that could become topics for public debate on social policy issues" (p. 53). The importanct point to emphasize here is that practitioners who have not been challenged to account for their own activity, or who have been discouraged from doing so, are not be able to see the extent to which their activities are socially conditioned. They have difficulties not just separating facts from values but from recognizing how their theoretical standpoints are influenced by the surrounding political economic context. To that extent, they will question neither the origins of nor their role as an individual in society. As Mannheim (1936) states in his book Ideology and Utopia:

> As long as one does not call his own position into question but regards it as absolute, while interpretating others ideas as a mere funtion of the social positions they occupy, the decisive step forward has not been taken. . . the [individual]. . . [must have]. . . the courage to subject not just others points of view, but all points of view, including his own, to the ideological analysis.

Although professionals in physical education and exercise sciences have not taken their field to lie within the political contexts of modern society, "this does not exempt their work from ideological meaning" (Mills, 1959, p. 49).

If human movement professionals are to understand themselves and their society, they must look beyond the individual and his or her immediate

surroundings. There are larger issues to be addressed than time on task, feedback schedules, student discipline, and building strength and endurance. Few things are more destructive to a sociological imagination than narrow instrumental and vocational concerns. Sport philosopher, Donna Mae Miller (1984), posed an appropriate question: "In our zeal to prepare students for job opportunities of a specialized nature, are we unduly narrowing their opportunities for achieving certain habits of mind and for examining the ends of living as well as the means?" (p. 28). One very real issue in this regard was raised by Neil Postman (1982): "Can a culture preserve humane values and create new ones by allowing modern technology the fullest possible authority to control its destiny" (p. 145).

The cultural meanings of natural science are becoming doubtful. As an intellectual force, natural science is increasingly being seen as inadequate. As research findings accumulate, they have not provided solutions to any problems widely known and deeply pondered by intellectual communities and cultural publics. Instead, they have raised more questions -- both intellectual and moral -- then they have solved, and the problems they have raised reside almost totally in the field of social not natural affairs.

The range of issues addressed in sport studies go beyond abstract empiricism to explore the social and material basis of culture and consciousness and the way in which relations of power and authority structure various cultural products, such as sports and games. "Sport, no matter how broadly or narrowly defined, is a cultural practice that tends to sustain structured relationships of domination and subordination," but sport is also a form of "cultural producation and as such is a creation of human agency" and therefore can be transformed (Hall, 1985).

Sports are constitutive practices embedded in a whole range of social

processes in which humans interact with one another (Gruneau, 1983; Voigt, 1974). "Problematic issues of professional interest within physical education and sport science [cannot] be seen out of the context of a more general concern and critical awareness of events which are occurring at the societal level itself" (Gruneau, 1978, p. 82). In a recent statement, Gruneau (1978) noted:

> The main thrust of the sociological analysis of sport should not be seen as the attempt to make isolated remarks about "what sport is like". . . rather, it should be seen as the continuous effort to relate sport to general features of social organization in order to gain a more coherent and comprehensive understanding of institutional arrangements and cultural values in the whole society and the place of sporting activities within them" (p. 82).

If human movement professionals are to maintain programs appropriate to the needs of students who will be working in physical activity and sport environments, they must do much more than prepare students with management strategies, technical knowledge, and sports skills. Robert Hollands (1984) has articulately described the importance of social analyses of physical activities:

> There is much more to play, games, leisure, and sport than technical knowledge and practical skills. As elements of contemporary popular culture, these human activities have far more impact and importance than is readily acknowledged. . . .students of sport [must] begin to understand the broader context of which these activities are a part. . . . The practical implications of a sociocultural understanding of play, games, and sport are broad and far-reaching. [And] it is only by coming to terms with the production, reproduction, and representation of cutural forms, and how these processes link up to the broader features of a society, that change becomes possible and

alternatives become realities.

Before concluding, there is a final point I wish to make. Although I have tried to show that sport studies should not be judged by the applications they can make to helping human movement professionals with their specific day-to-day tasks, I want to emphasize that sport studies do have good potential for applied, policy, and evaluation research that can help schools, teachers, coaches, and directors of fitness programs. Elaboration on this issue, however, would require another paper.

To conclude, the form and content of our preservice programs are in the hands of those who development curricula. The theme of my appeal is that courses in sports studies need to be an integral part of such programs. What is suggested is a rethinking of the organization of our preservice programs. I realize that the politics of curricular change have become a zero-sum game, where contenders for scarce resources battle over faculty positions. Given the politics and constraints with which we all must contend, nevertheless the shortsightedness of curricula planning that does not make room for the sport studies is a loss to us all, and especially to the students whom we are preparing for careers in teaching, coaching, exercise science, and leisure.

It seems to me that we have all spent too much time warring against each other. If we had spent the same amount of time in the past 15 years cooperatively trying to to find ways to improve the preparation of our students rather than promoting our own specialities while denograting the others, we would have all been better off, and it is likely that we would have made a greater contribution to to our own specialities. Understanding and cooperation is what is needed, and I for one would be overjoyed to see it in our future.

REFERENCES

Christie, R. & Geis, R. L. (1970). Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press.

Giddens, A. (1979). Central problems in social theory. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Graham, G. and Heimerer, E. (1981). "Research on teacher effectiveness: A summary with implications for teaching." Quest, 33, 14-25.

Gruneau, R. (1978). "Conflicting standards and problems of personal action in the sociology of sport." Quest, 30, 80-90.

Gruneau, R. (1983). Class, sports, and social development. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Hall, M. A. (1985). "How should we theorize sport in a capitalist patriarchy?" International Review of Sociology of Sport. 20, 109-115.

Hollands, R. G. (1984). "The role of cultural studies and social criticism in the sociological study of sport." Quest, 36, 66-79.

Ingham, A. G. (1985). "From public issue to personal trouble: Well-being and the fiscal crisis of the State." Sociology of Sport Journal. 2, 43-55.

Locke, L. F. and Dodds, P. (1984). "Is physical education teacher education in American colleges worth saving? Evidence, alternatives, judgment." In N. L. Struna (Ed.), Proceedings of the National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education, Volume V (pp. 91-107). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Locke, L. F. and Siedentop, D. (1980). "Beyond arrogance and ad hominem: A reply to Hal Lawson." Quest, 32, 31-43.

Loy, J. W. & Sage, G. H. (1978). "Athletic personnel in the academic marketplace." Sociology of Work and Occupations. 5, 446-469.

Mannheim, K. (1936). Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harcourt Brace

Jovanovich.

Massengale, J. D. & Sage, G. H. (1982). "Departmental prestige and career mobility patterns of college physical educators." Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport. 53, 305-312.

Miller, D. M. (1984). "Philosophy: Whose business?" Quest, 36, 26-36.

Mills, C. W. (1959). The sociological imagination. New York: Grove.

Postman, N. (1982). The disappearance of childhood. New York: Delacorte Press.

Sage, G. H. (1977). "Sport sociology: The state of the art and implications for physical education." In L. L. Gedvilas and M. E. Kneer (Eds.), Proceedings of the NCPEAM/NAPECW (pp. 310-319). Chicago: University of Illinois, Chicago Circle Publications Services.

Sage, G. H. (1973). "Occupational socialization and value orientation of athletic coaches." Research Quarterly. 44, 269-277.

Sage, G. H. (1972a). "Machiavellianism among college and high school coaches." Proceedings of the National College Physical Education Association for Men. (pp. 45-60). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Cooke Hall.

Sage, G. H. (1972b). "Value orientations of American college coaches compared to male college students and businessmen." Proceedings of the National College Physical Education Association for Men. (pp. 174-186). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Cooke Hall.

Sage, G. H. & Loy, J. W. (1978). "Geographical mobility patterns of college coaches." Urban Life. 7, 253-276.

Sage, G. H. & Massengale, J. D. (1985). "Prestige and regional mobility of doctoral faculty in graduate departments of physical education." Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport. 56, 170-175.

Siedentop, D. (1982). "Recent advances in pedagogical research in physical

education." In H. L. Eckert (Ed.), The Academy Papers: Synthesizing and transmitting knowledge, research and its applications (pp. 82-94). Reston, VA: AAHPERD.

Southard, D. (1982). "A national survey: Sociology of sport within American college and university physical education professional preparation programs." In A. O. Dunleavy, A. W. Miracle, and C. R. Rees (Eds.), Studies in the sociology of sport (pp. 365-372). Ft. Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.

Turner, R. H. (1960). "Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system." American Sociological Review. 25, 855-867.

Voigt, D. (1974). "Sociology in the training of the sport teacher and the teacher in general." International Journal of Physical Education, 10, 26-40.

Zeigler, E. F. (1980, October). "Without philosophy, coaches and physical educators are 'unguided missiles.'" The Physical Educator, 37, 122-127.